

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 23-26 in order to expedite prosecution. Support for the amendments can be found at least on pages 4-24 of the Specification and the accompanying Drawings. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 23-26 have been amended to address informalities noted by the Examiner. Applicants submit that the amendments overcome the claim objections and do not narrow the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim objections.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection

Claims 1-7, 10-17, and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Published Patent Application 2002-109194 A to Nishidate (“Nishidate”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 23 have been amended to recite “receiving a first request for caller information at a web server during a call session initiated in response to a telephone call from a caller; retrieving call information associated with said call session at said web server; retrieving said caller information using said call information, said caller information comprising an interactive voice response script or a web page template associated with said caller; retrieving call context information from a computer-telephony integration server that has registered said telephone call; generating a dynamic web page at said web server using said caller information and said call context information; and sending said web page in response to said first request.”

Independent claim 16 has been amended to recite “a communications web services interface to receive a first request for caller information during a call session initiated in response to a telephone call from a caller and retrieve call information

associated with said call session; and a web page generator to retrieve said caller information comprising an interactive voice response script or a web page template associated with said caller using said call information, and retrieve call context information from a computer-telephony integration server that has registered said telephone call, generate a web page using said caller information and said call context information, and send said web page in response to said first request.”

Applicant submits that Nishidate fails to teach or suggest at least the above-identified language of amended independent claims 1, 16, and 23. While Nishidate mentions notifying a web screen with the results of a search of a customer database, Nishidate does not teach or fairly suggest receiving a first request for caller information at a web server during a call session initiated in response to a telephone call from a caller, retrieving call information at said web server, retrieving call context information from a computer-telephony integration server that has registered said telephone call, and generating a dynamic web page at said web server using caller and call context information as recited in amended independent claims 1, 16, and 23. Applicant submits that such claims are allowable for at least this reason. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, 10-15, 17, and 24-26 are allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-7, 10-17, and 23-26.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 8 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishidate. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Regarding claim 8, Applicant submits that there is no explicit or implicit teaching, suggestion, or motivation to modify Nishidate to include all of the recited features of amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that dependent claim 8 is allowable by virtue of its dependency from amended independent claim 1 for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as on its own merits.

Independent claim 19 has been amended to recite “to receive a first request for caller information during a call session initiated in response to a telephone call from a caller, retrieve call information associated with said call session over said antenna; and a web page generator to retrieve said caller information comprising an interactive voice response script or a web page template associated with said caller using said call information, and retrieve call context information from a computer-telephony integration server that has registered said telephone call, generate a web page using said caller information and said call context information, and send said web page in response to said first request.”

Applicant submits that Nishidate fails to disclose at least the above-identified language of amended independent claim 19 and that there is no explicit or implicit teaching, suggestion, or motivation to modify Nishidate to include all of the recited features of amended independent claim 19. Applicant submits that amended independent claim 19 is allowable for at least this reason and that claims 20 and 21 are allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 8 and 19-21.

Claims 9 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishidate in view of United States Published Patent Application (USPPA) 2004/0083479 A1 to Bondarenko et al. (“Bondarenko”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant submits that the teachings of Bondarenko do not remedy the deficiencies of Nishidate with respect to amended independent claims 1 and 19. Namely, Bondarenko does not teach or fairly suggest receiving a first request for caller information at a web server during a call session initiated in response to a telephone call from a caller, retrieving call information at said web server, retrieving call context information from a computer-telephony integration server that has registered said telephone call, and generating a dynamic web page at said web server using caller and call context information as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 19.

Therefore, even if Bondarenko and Nishidate could be combined, which Applicant does not admit, such combination would still fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent amended claims 1 and 19. As such, Applicant submits that Nishidate and Bondarenko are insufficient to render obvious amended independent claims 1 and 19, regardless of whether such references are taken alone or in combination with each other. Applicant submits, therefore, that dependent claims 9 and 22 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 9 and 22.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishidate in view of USPPA 2003/0061569 A1 to Aoki ("Aoki"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant submits that the teachings of Aoki do not remedy the deficiencies of Nishidate with respect to amended independent claim 16. Namely, Aoki does not teach or fairly suggest receiving a first request for caller information at a web server during a call session initiated in response to a telephone call from a caller, retrieving call information at said web server, retrieving call context information from a computer-telephony integration server that has registered said telephone call, and generating a dynamic web page at said web server using caller and call context information as recited in amended independent claim 16.

Therefore, even if Aoki and Nishidate could be combined, which Applicant does not admit, such combination would still fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent amended 16. As such, Applicant submits that Nishidate and Aoki are insufficient to render obvious amended independent claim 16, regardless of whether such references are taken alone or in combination with each other. Applicant submits, therefore, that dependent claim 18 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency, as well as on its own merits.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claim 18.

Conclusion

It is believed that claims 1-26 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to the credit card in the previously filed credit card authorization form.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC



Robert V. Racunas, Reg. No. 43,027
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: January 30, 2008

4500 Brooktree Road, Suite 102
Wexford, PA 15090
(724) 933-5529